DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 088 SO 010 902

AUTHOR Button, Warren
TITLE Creating More Useable Pasts: History in the Study of Education.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Asscciation (Toronto, Ontario, March 27-31, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educaticnal Change; *Educational History; Educational Improvement; Educational Innovation; Educaticnal Problems; Educational Psychology; *Educational Research; Educational Sociolcgy; Educational Theories; Evaluation; Futures (of Society); *Historiography; *History; Institutional Research; Literature Reviews; Research Methcdology; Research Needs; Research Utilization; Social Change; *State of the Art Reviews; Values

ABSTRACT

Because history describes and explains the past, it is a relevant tool for many other disciplines, including education. Historical studies can contribute to the improvement of schooling by providing information, demonstrating errors of memory, helping explain the present, and encouraging the introduction of new concepts. In the past, educational histories have examined topics including school government and organization, schcol administration, and possible local sources of information about an area's educational history. References which illustrate this focus are (1) "Education in the United States: Its History from the Earliest Settlements," 1889, by Richard G. Boone, (2) "Public Education in the United States," 1919, by Elwood Cubberley, and (3) "The Wonderful World of Elwood Cubberley," 1960, by Lawrence Cremin. Since 1960, educational historians have shown increasing interest in statistical analysis, computers, extensions of the boundaries of education beyond the school, history of the common man, and political and policy changes. New approaches in the historical study of educaticn and educational research may result in introduction of new ccncepts, redefinition and revitalizaticn of older concepts, and new generalizaticns about a broad range of educational problems. (Author/DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155088

7.07

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Warren Button

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CREATING MORE USEABLE PASTS: HISTORY IN THE STUDY OF EDUCATION

Warren Button

State University of New York at Buffalo

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AERA, Toronto, 1978

Printed in the U.S.

SP010902

It was decided by an eminent committee of obviously practical men, dedicated pragmatists, that the subject of the series of lectures of which this is one was to be, first of all, "what works,"/what is it good for? This is a question with a long past, although not an entirely untarnished past. It is not the question upon which my mind tends to dwell. But, I have come to concede that it is a legitimate question.

"History" is the past in one sense of the word. In that sense, history has made us. "History" is, in another sense and in the sense which I will use it here, a description and explanation of the past. In that sense we create history. Or, rather, we create histories, each of them depending upon our interest, our point of view, our purpose. Well written, a history can fascinate. Well researched, history can inform.

For those who are not historians, let me first say about the nature of history and the nature, I suppose, of historians. History of education is a hybrid specialty, as are sociology of education and educational psychology. Like them, it comes from a parent which is a "pure" discipline. Unlike sociology of education and educational psychology, it comes from a pure discipline which is one of the humanities. The grand strategies of all empirical inquiry, all inquiry about the real palpable world whether in the physical sciences, the social sciences, or history, seems to me to be the same. What may be unique to a particular field of inquiry is its tactical approaches. History has its own tactics, its own conventions, its own canons of research. It

answers in its own way the analogues of the empiricists' questions of reliability and validity. History lives with its uncertainties, as the social sciences live with probabilistic findings.

The social scientist is interested in widely applicable findings and theory. The historian is sometimes interested in these matters. On other occasions the historian is interested in the particular, the unique event, the specific era, the set of events closely interrelated. Almost uniquely, a part of the past of the discipline of history is a literary one. In the United States, the first great historians - Irving, Prescott, Bancroft - were as much interested in form as in content. This is not a tradition which has wholly disappeared; an occasional Pulitzer prize still goes to the primarily nonacademic historian, most recently to Paul Horgan, but also to Margaret Leech a decade or so ago. I must concede that our literary tradition is often honored by violation, and that historians, including historians of education, frequently write exclusively for each other, and do that rather poorly.

As background, the nature of history of education may be useful. My primary concerns are the uses and applications of history of education, of its applications and uses, and, finally, with some possible pasts of educational research.

Anatomy of History

The proper historian's manner is to begin with a brief history of educational history. Because there may be historians here, I will be brief.

The usual starting place for a history of education is with Richard G. Boone's Education in the United States: Its History From the Earliest Settlements, (1889).[2] The first booklength history of United State's schools, it came before the establishment of the American Historical Association, when

college faculty American historians numbered no more than a few dozen. Education in the United States was a history of the government and organization of schools, maybe following the example of American historians generally, who dealt with the government and organization of the United States, only with stirring martial interludes. Boone's handling of history was largely unquestioned in his day. Although there were seemingly alternatives, history of education was the history of the establishment, organization, consolidation, and inevitable triumph of the public schools. Developed by Paul Monroe of Teachers College, Columbia, it was brought to fruition by Monroe's former student, Elwood P. Cubberley of Stanford. His primary interest in school administration may have strengthened the historical convention of his predecessors. For two or three decades, Cubberley's Public Education in the United States (1919) was the standard introductory text. Students were to be inspired, not to say indoctrinated. Cubberley's book, last revised in 1933, is still in print. There were variations, of course. Edgar W. Knight gave greater weight to schools in the South. R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin emphasized the intellectual aspects of school development. There were other, minor, variations on the theme, but history of education was generally in-house, by educators, for education students, and about schools, celebrating their inevitable and magnificent triumph.

The triumphant official history of U.S. education survived nearly without challenge until mid-twentieth century, far outlasting education's old non-empirical moral psychology, which had been discarded by 1915. The original utilitarian sociology of schools was undergoing revision in the 1920's. The Cubberley tradition of history of education was reconsided and largely supplanted in the 1960's.

Barnard Bailyn, prominent historian of colonial America, was one of the

first and most influential of critics. "Education," he argued, was properly defined as the sum of everything intended to enculturate child, youth, and adult; family, church, newspaper, and so on. Among institutions intended to enculturate, schools, especially colonial schools, were a small part of the pattern and process. Bailyn's advice was in some ways awkward to accept. It entailed a complete redefinition of a subfield of history. More exactly, it abolished the definition. History of education was cultural history and social history, all of history but "with politics left out." It was a prospect which opened bright possibilities for us. It was also life in a ganzfeld, a world without cues and direction.

The second critic of the 1960's was Lawrence A. Cremin. (Cremin as historian has many strengths: The most unusual of them is the ability to reconsider, and to change his mind.) In The Wonderful World of Elwood Cubberley, a critique and bibliographic essay, his formulation of the history of education was that it should be a history of "institutions" which have educated, not only schools but also families, churches, libraries, publishers, newspapers, television, and so on. These institutions were to be seen in the context of the society of their time.[3] The field of history of American education had undergone a complete redefinition of its subject. I would add that the redefinition has led to conceptual problems still unresolved. But we were free to leave the schools.

Second, there was a political reorientation of history of education. Several new historians of education brought to the history of education new political orientations. Cubberley had been sure that all had been for the best. By the 1960's, some had no such certainty. First, Raymond E. Callahan brought to the history of education the old radical conviction that in a great many ways schools had worked out badly, that reform was an imperative.

Callahan's Education and the Cult of Efficiency was dedicated to George S. Counts, who of course had been one of the pioneer radical sociologists of education.

One of the most prominent historians of education in the 1960's and 1970's has been Michael B. Katz, who has not been in doubt that in a great many ways schools had worked out badly: He has been categorically certain that was the case, perhaps as sure in his conviction as Cubberley had been. Katz's contributions to history of education have been devoted to why schools did and do support existing class structure because of their formal, hierarchical, bureaucratic, unyielding nature.[4] The first modification of the field of history of education had been the extention or abolition of its boundaries. The second was a change in values and in political and social philosophy.

Third, more peacefully, there have been in the last ten years or so changes in methodology in history of education.[5] The old canons and techniques are still valid, still useful. But, although historians lagged behind empiricists, some did discover the usefulness of the computer and statistical analysis. There are questions, as Graff said, which are essentially quantitative. Three papers to be presented at this meeting are examples: To what extent was school attendance related to the nativity of pupils' parents and grandparents in 1870?[6] In Ontario, between 1871 and 1910, which families sent their children to the high schools?[7] In the United States of 1870, how strongly was each of several logical causes related to the recruiting of women as teachers in place of men? How strongly related was it to man-woman pay differences? To the shortage of male labor? To school bureaucratization?[8]

A part of the advantage of quantification in social and educational history is that it allows historians to follow a recent interest, an interest in the history of the common man - no depreciation intended - "history from

the bottom up," grassroots history. Records for history in this vein are likely to be thin and fragmentary; for coherence it is necessary to mine every source. For instance, for a quantitative study of Buxton, a black antebellum haven in Ontario, it is necessary to assemble data from perhaps fifteen thousand entries in the Census manuscripts of 1861, 1871, and 1881, from town auditors' accounts, and church records.[9] The research necessity for compilation and statistical treatment, by unfortunate paradox, produces history almost without personalities, even without names. Still, this new history has and will produce new understandings and counterweight our longstanding concern for "the better sort."

So much for the history of history. But it is necessary to say something about historians' politics. Being invariably otherwise minded, I disagree with many of my colleagues. One of our disagreements is politics, and there is no doubt that our politics have influenced our historical interests and choices of topics and theses. Reversing an epigram, Sol Cohen has said that under some circumstances, "History is a trick played on the dead by the living."[10, 11] The most frequent circumstance in history of education is the combination of high political zeal and sloppy historiography. Simply, the past is misrepresented.

Historians' discussion of politics is sometimes earblinding loud, and it occasionally falls short of profound wisdom. But if the choices are loud political discussion or loud silence, discussions are to be preferred. Not to voice an opinion is to acquiesce. To acquiesce is to support the present state of things, to be conservative. Even if the schools are not all bad, they surely are not all good, or even good in every fundamental way. They are flawed in practice and flawed in principle. Perhaps the former we can leave to the technologists. The latter demands discussion, and policy change,

political change. To alter another epigram, "Politics is too important to leave to politicians."

But my description of the historian's history is only preparatory. It describes how we work. My charge was to talk about what works.

Uses of the Past

To repeat, "history" is not, except in a certain philosophic sense, the past. "History" is a description and interpretation of the past. It is "history" in this sense which can be useful. It should be useful, although it should not be merely useful.

For the improvement of schooling - I suppose in this context the yardstick of "what works" - there are several uses of history. History can inform, can fill some of the gaps in our knowledge. History can demonstrate the errors of commonplace memory, and history is useful when it does because policy or practice founded upon erroneous supposition is likely to be policy or practice which is less sound. History can explain the present, how we have gotten to where we are. It can generate hypotheses which account for the schools' obstinate perverse adamantine resistance to change. History can lead to the formulation of general laws, in this context concerning schools, schooling and education, but in other contexts far broader laws which attempt to the cosmic, even the cosmologic. History can lead to the introduction of concepts. "Paradigm shifts" are the subject of continuing discussion among SCHOOL administrators. As most of us know and some of us forget, the concept of "paradigm shift" came out of historical inquiry. In a narrower and more modest sphere, history can apply concepts and theory. It should, can, and does explain past events least inadequately, which is to say that the historian applies a variety of theories and provides explanation.

Several factors determine the form history of education takes. History

follows where current events lead it, as it should. The form of history of education is partly determined by developments in "mainline" history, our parent discipline. Historical research, like that of the social sciences, is shaped by available technology, by the availability of computers and appropriate software. As what seems to me to be one fairly exotic example, there have been historical applications of nonparametric clustering techniques. Photoreproduction has made available to most of us a far greater variety of primary and secondary sources. The form of history is shaped also by the concepts and methods available from the social sciences generally. A new or variant social science formulates new history; Eric Erikson himself wrote in the terms of his own psychoanalytic theory a new biography of Martin Luther, a biography which was not ignored. Unlike many of the research fields in education, history has not been influenced by the vagaries of research funding. There is no federal agency which has made more than token contributions to the funding of research of history of education. We have remained impoverished, but our impoverishment has left us free.

What history of education can do is more important and more relevant than what it cannot do, but it somewhat clears the perspective to note some of the things it cannot do. For the same reasons that one cannot get from solely <u>is</u> to <u>should</u>, one cannot go from solely <u>was</u> to <u>should</u>. History cannot determine desirable practice (though history in another sense has indeed determined practice good and bad). History speaks to what has been and is and why it has been and is. History cannot predict the future. By itself, history cannot predict at all. Of course the past does not repeat itself in any important way. The future, agreeably or not, will be different from the past and the present. History to a large degree describes. It does in part explain, although these explanations are also dependent upon the theories of the social sciences

~~generally in large degree~~. History in the sense in which I speak of it cannot determine the future. More concretely, history cannot verify theory. With a very occasional ~~occasion~~ exception there are no opportunities to transform thesis into hypothesis. As a rule of thumb, if there is no stringent test there can be no strong verification.

Reviews of the literature are available elsewhere, and a review of the literature is not appropriate here.[12] But, some examples of the usefulness of history will serve a purpose.

History, as I have said, can inform. Probably more than in any other part of educational history there has been informative work on the history of school administration. Most of the history of school administration written in the last fifteen years has been by revisionists committed to change in administrative patterns in the cause of the improvement of schools. Cubberley's account of an evolution of organization and administration to a laudable condition has been demolished. It is clear that the use in school administration of management standards of "efficiency" and business procedures was initially the result of outside pressures and influences, and not a thing which was an organic part of schools, schooling, or the process of education. It is clear that the influence of city superintendents in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century led to uniformity at the cost of appropriateness. It is strongly argued that the development of the typical city school administrative bureaucratic hierarchy was not inevitable, and that there were real alternatives to it, far less constraining alternatives. It has been shown that, as a structural-functional sociologist might have supposed, there have often been close interrelationships between the administrative, organizational, and curricular patterns of the schools. These historians' conclusions have become a part of the general

literature of school administration. It is nice irony that so much of the contribution of revisionist historians has been with bounds much like Cubberley's, contributions to the study of school organization.

The events of the last twenty-five years have brought to the attention of historians the history of the education of blacks. Although there are still some gaps, the history of schooling of blacks is no longer composed of a few platitudes and much ignorance. There are exceptions in history of education, of course, but generally blacks are no longer the "invisible men." There is historical knowledge of the segregation of blacks, of the series of court decisions from at least 1853 and almost without exception until Brown vs. Kansas in 1954, upholding segregation. Paralleling the history of de jure segregation there is another history, even less honorable, of de facto segregation.

History can be informative about past events. It can also be informative about past nonevents, the parts of the past about which there have been fable, counterfactual fable, myth. Granting that the matter is of greatest interest to historians, the example which comes to mind is the genesis of modern public education which from the point of view of Cubberley was in the "common school revival" of the early and middle nineteenth century. Before that, the fable went, the schools were a shambles. Granted that there had been at least a few good schools and dedicated New England school masters in the 1600's - Cheever of course came to mind - schools had suffered a ruinous decline in the 1700's. They were rescued and reconstructed through the efforts of the common school revivalists, particularly Horace Mann. This was a fable of nonevents in two ways at least. First, after Axtell's re-examination of New England schools in the eighteenth century, it was clear that there had not been a decline in the schools then.[13] At most there had been a shift in emphasis, away from classics and toward more immediately utilitarian curricula. Second,

if an important part of the common school revival had been the enrollment of a larger fraction of the children - a movement toward universal public education - the common school revival in Massachusetts, where of course Mann was state superintendent of schools, did not revive, or at least did not much increase attendance. Attendance before the revival was low, but increasing slightly. Attendance after the revival was somewhat higher, and still increasing slightly. The myth had been an error, had misled, had overglorified the common school revivalists, had on the basis of two nonevents glorified and mythologized schoolmens' most famous precursors, the declared founding fathers.

History describes: It is more valuable when it explains. There have been historical accounts which have explained an event or a set of events on the basis of a single theory and a single set of concepts, or little more than that. But, more frequently, the historical explanation is a "thick" one, an attempt to use any concept available to him to explain, if its use increases plausibility and a reduction in uncertainty.

As an example, Tyack has explained the decline of the city schools.[14] In 1900, the city schools were seen as very good, compared with small town and country schools. By the 1960's, they were seen as not nearly as good as the suburban schools, and were, in Tyack's words, "under fire," unsatisfactorily ineffective, archaic, nonresponsive. In fifteen pages, he explains the city schools' poor performance. First, there was a matter of organizational sociology. The organizational pattern which had been laudable had become overelaborate, archaic, unresponsive, and sometimes broke down. Second, there were staffing inadequacies. These are explained as resulting from the sociology of an occupation to which underprepared candidates were admitted. There was a social-psychological shortcoming, low morale. There was also an

economic basis for staffing difficulties; teachers were underpaid. The same limits in financing had left city systems with overcrowded obsolete buildings. Later there was a demographic phenomenon, the baby boom and increase in enrollment, and the exodus of the middle class to the suburbs. The latter had been speeded by a governmental, F.H.A., policy. There was, using the word in its usual sense, a political factor, McCarthyism. There was another economic factor, the poverty of the pupils who remained in the city schools, and still another social factor, their "social disadvantage." All in all, it is a good example of a "thick" explanation, the substance of which I have not adequately presented here. There is only one reservation, that even a sound diagnosis does not always suggest an appropriate remedy.

For the historian, the formulation of law or theory is an unusual undertaking. The most conspicious enterprises in this direction, Oswald Spengler's and Arnold Toynbee's, rest heavily upon a history as philosophic interpretation of the past. Because of their claim of lawfulness, Spengler's and Toynbee's work has sometimes been more interesting to sociologists than to historians. The less elaborate outcome of historians' formulating has been that of a single concept. Max Weber's Protestant Ethic, for example, was derived from historical study, although it is seen as sociological. Weber lives on in sociology: In history he is forgotten or in disrepute.

More recently developed, Kuhn's "paradigm" and "paradigm shift" are conceptualizations of a science's prevailing views and of the sudden changes which they undergo.[15] They describe the interrelationships of scientific theories and perspectives, and of their replacement over time. Williams' "keywords" suggests (the sometimes evanescent) shaping and reshaping of pivotal terms and concepts in the service of political agenda.[16] Ariès demonstrates the birth of a

concept, "child," and the concept's definition of role.[17] Foucault's "épistèmès" describe realms of converse, and the relationship of concept and form of social control.[18] Taken together they suggest enticing if misty prospects of historical knowledge of the ways in which words, thought, and reality have intertwined.

The most important recent formulation of lawful or general relationships in history has been that by Michael B. Katz. He argues far more persuasively and elegantly than I can here that society in the United States, rigid and stratified and with predisposition to do so, shaped, about a hundred years ago, the school bureaucracy, and that the bureaucracy has perpetuated both itself and conservative patterns of schooling, which in turn have perpetuated a rigid and stratified society.[19] Therefore, "...(T)here can be no meaningful educational reform which is not at the same time part of a broader effort to alter the inequities which both Canadian and American schools have been designed to sustain."[20] Katz's thesis has often been accepted, and for good reason. It has parsimony. Katz has supported it impressively, as have others. At the same time it is possible to form countertheses. At times it has a strong feeling of cheerless inevitability about it, as Cubberley's did, but one must say in fairness that Katz has denied the immutability of this state of affairs and its cheerlessness.[21]

Change in organization and administration of the schools has seemed crucial if the schools were to be changed. The past of school organizations has been investigated effectively because appropriate concepts from organizational sociology and political science have suggested theses and modes of attack. Historians have found colleagues in departments of school administration with parallel interests. Formal organizations have formal records, sometimes as a matter of definition, and historians have located and utilized

them. For all these reasons, school organization and administration has been a field inviting historical study, and an area in which there has been substantial historical conclusions. The effects of centralization of authority have been heavily documented. There have been descriptions of the ways schools have changed since the establishment of bureaucracies. Other historians' conclusions have already been mentioned.

There has also been productive historical work in other directions. Because success in school and afterward has seemed to depend upon the structure of one's family, and because the success of blacks, and black students, has been of paramount importance, research in the history of black families has been important. It is clear that the formerly conventional portrait of the black family as fragmented and incomplete has been heavily overstated. The conventional view of families more generally, which has been that the family changed in structure from extended to nuclear, has been revised. There are unresolved questions - always - but it seems clear that, always in America, and in England since the eve of the Industrial Revolution, and in a number of other places and times, families have been nuclear. I will not catalog the knowledge relevant to education which historians have generated in the last decade or so. Relevancy may be obvious, it may be incidental.

Of course there is history of education which does not have utilitarian applications to schools. Utility is only one measure of value, and history has other values. History of education provides general background, and has the purposes of an institutional Roots. Like any field of inquiry, it asks its own questions, and tries to answer them. History should create pasts which are useful in many ways.

For a historian an AERA meeting, preponderantly devoted to empiricism as

it is, does have attractions. Of course it has attractions because all of us share a common substantive interest, the schools. Historians, less cereberally, attend AERA meetings because our friends do. But we profit from association with empiricists and social scientists in ways which I cannot put better than the past vice-president of Division "F" last year. Callahan said then that:

> In my work ... I used data from Robert Lynd's pioneering study of Middle town which was done in the early twenties. And I used George Counts' study of the social composition of school boards and his study of school and society in Chicago... And I used Willard Waller's extensive study of schools and classrooms in Pennsylvania... And the Yankee City series was helpful...[22]

Each of us could provide our own examples. We would not learn of them through AHA or OAH, the societies of the parent discipline. We as historians are users of the social sciences, in a way like the administrator who is attempting to understand, for instance, the attitudes of parents toward extracurricular sports.

A certain historical knowledge, I suggest, might be useful to empiricists. Societies, after all, change over time, and what may indeed have been lawful or at least statistical relationships in the past may no longer hold. It was possible in the fifties to forecast on the basis of demographics - age, sex, and so on - the behaviors of voters in school elections: It seems not to be possible now. Cultures change over time, and as they change conventions and customs change. The role of those who taught in colonial America was that of a man, although of course women did teach. The stereotype role of those who taught in the United States a century later was that of a woman, although, of course, men did teach, and of course the role changed in other ways. As

conventions and manners and roles have changed, people have changed with them. As a last example, the accounts of the Battle of Waterloo I have read graphically describe the wounded. No matter how badly mutilated they do not seem to have had the symptoms of shock. Perhaps conventions go deeper than we think.

Perhaps some historical skills might on occasion be useful to the empiricist. If he is interested in change over time, there are vast banks of utilizable data, ranging from police blotters to mission society membership lists. The data which are recoverable will not be ideal, but I suspect all data are like that.

Pasts of Research

There is another plausable and potentially informative relationship between the historian of education and that of his empirical colleagues. That relationship has not been much exploited, unfortunately but understandably. If educational research - and development - have been important for their consequences, educational research is worth the educational historian's study. If one of our joint concerns is the improvement of schooling by the application of new research-derived knowledge, past efforts to generate that knowledge, and the ways it has been applied, deserve the historian's attention.

My interest in the history of educational research is not value-free, of course. History is not and cannot be value-free. I have no obligation to set aside my values. It is incumbent upon me to make them explicit. Most briefly, I believe that educational research had unparalleled promise, but that its promise has not been more than fragmentally fulfilled. Unlike Michael Katz, I have not abandoned the hope that schools can be changed, changed in nontrivial ways. I am aghast at pseudoengineering, pseudoscience, pseudoexpertise.

A part of the history of educational research will be a history of the

effects of research outcomes. Some of these will have been as intended. Other effects will have been unforeseen. The historian would not only be interested in what the effects have been, but how they acted, and why at least some of them have been widely and speedily accepted. Still other parts of the history of educational research should be biographical, biographies of men, biographies of ideas, biographies of institutions and "invisible colleges."

The historian of educational research would start by framing a set of questions, guideposts for his path of research, trial conceptualizations. Hopefully, the questions would be independent, but probably they would not be. As a first approximation the questions might be these:

What have been the outcomes of educational research? (To presume that there has been no detectable effect is obviously a null thesis, as nondemonstrable as a null hypothesis.) What forms has the outcome taken? Hardware, such as the tachistoscope? Technical, such as the Peabody Reading Readiness Test? Conceptual, providing new perspectives, new or modified theory, new paradigms, as Piaget's psychology seems to have done in the last decade?

What impacts have these research outcomes had? Today's successful research outcome will have been assimilated in a decade, and obscured. But research which fails will not necessarily sink into obscurity. What ideas and sorts of ideas have been originated or introduced by research? Nearing's and Counts' studies of the social class membership of school boards has had direct and

In what ways have the effects of educational research been unforeseen? Joel Spring argues that "mental testing," at one point a hasty purely pragmatic effort for the classification of army draftees in World War I, led to "sorting" and pigeonholing of pupils, and the defamation of American subcultures.[23] One may have reservations about parts of Spring's arguments, but the likelihood

of research having some unfortunate effects should not be ignored. As an analogy, DDT did kill insects, as intended. But, it also decimated the bald eagle, and that needed to be known, too.

In what manners have the products of research affected schooling? There have been research results which have been almost directly applicable to schools and classrooms. But, as a tentative thesis, the research outcomes which have been transposed directly or even via development centers to school and classroom have been far more often than not trivial. Outcomes which have been immediately applicable, most often technological outcomes, have been those which have promised increased effectiveness in terms of already existing objectives, have been utilizable within the limits of existing school budgets, and which have fit conveniently into current thought or practice. Immediately applicable outcomes have been adopted within the stringent constraints of school organizations. More formally, as a thesis: Some prospectively beneficial research outcomes have been adopted by schools in a manner similar to that of the adoption of technological improvements in other fields, similar to that of, say, hybrid seed corn in farming and antibiotics in medicine.

A number of researchers have commented that a valuable outcome of research has been the introduction of new concepts, new ways of seeing. A second incipient thesis on the uses of educational research, more difficult to demonstrate but prospectively more fruitful, is that educational research has had the greatest long range effects when it has provided new ways of seeing and thinking about schools and pupils. As illustrative examples, the introduction of social class analysis by Nearing and Counts returns to mind. One of the forming ideas in history of education and in educational administration in the last twenty years has been the application of concepts of formal organization. (This by itself would be an engaging study in simultaneous discovery and

introduction: It appears quite independently in at least three sources at nearly the same time.) In educational psychology, Freudian psychology at the beginning of the century and Skinnerian psychology since midcentury have clearly provided new ways of seeing and ways of doing. It would not be difficult to provide other examples.

As a tentative thesis on the effects of research, I would argue that the outcomes of research have had widest acceptance when they have been the synthesis of a new set of concepts, or the redefinition and revitalization of older ones. Kurt Lewin's "democratic-autocratic-laissez faire" study in leadership was such a redefinition and revitalization. Another concept redefined both in theory and operationally was Adorno's "authoritarian personality." As a third example, Piaget's developmental psychology has provided a different and promising view. Thorndike in his great days provided conceptualization as well as information.

Some proposed paradigms are set aside because they are not worth adopting. They fail intellectual criteria. They lack plausibility, logic, relatedness. There is another, though not invariable phenomenon which is tantalizing: Often a new paradigm has had widest impact upon speech and presumably upon thought when it has harmonized with the temper of the times. The papers based on Lewin's "democratic-autocratic-laissez faire" study, probably more widely cited than any research of their time, appeared when the threat by Nazis and Fascists seemed greatest. Adorno's "authoritarian personality" was prominent partly because it grew from the same general concern. But, as counterexample, there is not even an intuitive link between Piaget's psychology and the temper of his times in France. The connection seems clear in some cases, obscure or nonexistent in others. In addition, it seems not to have mattered much that Lewin's study has not been replicable. Rosenthal and Jacobson's Pygmalion in the Classroom has also failed of replication, and had technical flaws as

well. Perhaps nonevents are events, if judged solely by their effects. But more immediately, research has been more or less influential depending upon its perceived public relevance at the time.

To repeat, part of the history of educational research will be biographical. There is a meticulous biography of Edward L. Thorndike, and another of G. Stanley Hall, but that is only the beginning. What can be said about Jacob Meyer Rice, outspoken early but enigmatic late? There has been no published biography.

We lack biographies of men: We also lack biographies of ideas, of concepts. It is not that there has been a lack of the study of the words of great men about great issues; that vein of intellectual history has been worked and overworked. We do lack histories of the modes and concepts in which researchers have thought. An ill-formed example is that of the use of quantitative analysis in education. Its antecedent was the use of statistics in eugenics; prior to that it was introduced to public affairs by a Belgian astronomer quite famous in his day. Statistics did not leap full formed from the head of a mathematician to that of an educationist. The path it followed was a long and crooked one, about which we know too little. Of course the uses and conventions of statistics underwent changes when they were transported from field to field, from land to land. There are always sea changes. Perhaps if we knew of the development and transportation of ideas we would have better information where to seek them.

If a history of educational research should include biographies of men and biographies (figuratively) of concepts, it should include the biographies of institutions. In an intellectual sense Teachers College, Columbia, is the ancestor of us all. Its early history needs redoing. Teachers College was the premier visible college; of course there have been others, and there have been

"invisible colleges," informal associations of researchers separated by space but brought together by interests. The least invisible of the "invisible colleges" are those which have formed around measurement instruments. There have been dozens of researchers who have based studies on the MTAI and, in an area marginal to education, dozens of dozens who have conducted research utilizing the Strong Vocational Inventory Test.

There would be other facets of the history of educational research if time - and the forebearance of my listeners - allowed. But even with these stringencies, it is to be observed that a part of the history of educational research is political. ("Political" is the process which determines who gets what, and how.) What research has been funded? Why? There has been no general description of twenty-five years of changes and discontinuities of federal funding of research. There is no careful account of the relationship between funding agencies and Congress. The inner workings of HEW are masked or obscure. Historians do not think that grantsmen are gentlemen, but that they are something like gentlemen. They take but never tell.

There may be other facets of it, too. As a last example, we have no clear picture of the impact of hardware technology upon research in education, although imagining an empiricist researcher without his computer is more difficult than imagining Galileo without a telescope.

The pasts of educational research are diverse; they are the pasts of successes in any of several modes, direct and indirect. There have been failures enough and more, but we will leave them undisturbed - except of course when they are informative. There are pasts of unforeseen consequences, the educational equivalents of DDT. But, I need not paraphrase my other questions. For a historian, the past of empirical research is researchable. For the empiricist, it is a past worth knowing.

Historical research in education is not an analogue of empirical quantitative research in education. The results of historical research in education are useful, but must be used in their own ways. History has limits, because it cannot provide the degree of certainty which comes from the testing of hypotheses. History has strengths; wide perspectives, long views, rich sources and rich data. History is not solely utilitarian; it could not be, it should not be. But, history has been used and should be used for the improvement of education.

FOOTNOTES

1. My title and part of my approach were suggested by Van Wyck Brooks, "On Creating a Useable Past," Dial, LXIV (1918), pp. 337-346.

2. For a more detailed account, see Lawrence A. Cremin, The Wonderful World of Ellwood Patterson Cubberley (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965).

3. Ibid., p. 48.

4. Michael B. Katz, Class, Bureaucracy and the Schools (New York: Praeger, 1975), pp. xv-ccii.

5. For a fuller discussion, see Harvey J. Graff, "'The New Math': Quantification in the 'New' History, and the History of Education," Urban Education, XI (1977), pp. 403-440, upon which this is in part based.

6. Edward Stevens and Lee Sutlow, Ohio University, "Quantitative Factors in the Acculturation of Immigrant Children in Mid-Nineteenth Century United States," AERA paper, 1978.

7. Anthony Ketchum, Ontario Institute for the Study of Education, "Students in Ontario Secondary Schools, 1871-1910," AERA paper, 1978.

8. Jo Ann Day, University of Illinois, "Urbanization, School System Variables, and the Sex Composition of Teaching: An Historical View," AERA paper, 1978.

9. Beverly H. Nenno, dissertation in progress, State University of New York at Buffalo.

10. Sol Cohen, "The History of the History of American Education, 1900-1976: The Uses of the Past," Harvard Educational Review, XLVI (1976), p. 330.

11. Cohen's article, pp. 298-330, stresses what I have called the politics of the history of education.

12. Cf. Douglas Sloan, "Historiography and the Study of Education," in Fred H. Kerlinger (ed.), Review of Research in Education, I (Itasca, Ill.: Peacock, 1973) pp. 239-269.

13. James L. Axtell, The School Upon a Hill (New Haven: Yale, 1974). Albert Fishlow, "The American Common School Revival: Fact or Fancy?" in Henry Rosovsky (ed.), Industrialization in Two Systems... (New York: Wiley, 1968). See also Maris A. Vinovskis, "Trends in Massachusetts Education, 1826-1860," History of Education Quarterly, XII (1972), pp. 501-529.

14. David B. Tyack, The One Best System (Cambridge: Harvard, 1974), pp. 273-280.

15. Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1970).

16. Raymond Williams, Keywords (New York: Oxford, 1976).

17. Philippe Aries, Centuries of Childhood (New York: Vintage, 1965).

18. Michel Foucault, Madness and Civilization (New York: Pantheon, 1965); The Order of Things (New York: Pantheon, 1970). Foucault's style is difficult. A useful introduction is Clifford Geertz, "Stir Crazy," a review of Foucault's Discipline and Punish..., New York Review, XXIV (Jan. 26, 1978), pp. 3 ff.

19. Katz, loc cit., esp. pp. 57-59, 105-110.

20. Michael B. Katz, "Class Bureaucracy and the Schools," Canadian Forum, Oct.-Nov., 1972, p. 16.

21. Michael B. Katz, School Reform: Past and Present (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971), p. 2.

22. Raymond E. Callahan, Washington University, "History, the Social Sciences & Education... Vice-Presidential Address," AERA, 1977, p. 15.

23. Joel H. Spring, Education and the Rise of the Corporate State (Boston: Beacon, 1972).